

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/039,438 | 03/16/1998 | WOO-SUP SHIN | 041992-5037 | 9576 |
| 30827 | 7590 03/03/2003 | | | |
| MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| 1900 K STRI WASHINGT | EET, NW ON, DC 20006 | | ZERVIGON, RUDY | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1763 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 03/03/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/039,438 | SHIN ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Rudy Zervigon | 1763 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applicate a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely | ation. A proper reply to a | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7. ☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☑ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-25</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 3. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | | |
| J. Falcin and Haucitain Unite | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains the rejections. Applicant states that the Examiner has misinterpritted Applicant's "connecting passage". However, as was established in the Final Rejection, Nelson teaches piping conduit that directly connects a first (20) and second tank (4). Specifically, the connecting piping between Nelson's first and second tanks includes piping 31-30, and, to continue, piping 7-8-10 forming the "passage" as demonstrated by Nelson.

JEFFRIE R. LUND PRIMARY EXAMINER

Amrel